To: FCC Commissioners

RE: Comments of- David Allan Fanelli

"2.) I must disagree with the philosophy contained in this Petition that the FCC must limit the bandwidth of some emissions but not all emissions. Pactor 3 has been singled out by this Petition as "inharmonious and incompatible with the accepted operating principles of Amateur Radio on the HF bands". By using the same measure, Double Sideband - Transmitted Carrier (DSB-TC) or standard AM is not permissible on voice bands since DSB-TC uses twice the bandwidth of Single Sideband - Suppressed Carrier (SSB-SC) or what is referred to as Single Sideband. An operator using DSBTC can interfere with two SSB-SC communications due to the increased bandwidth and not know that this interference is being caused since a normal DSB-TC receiver will not decode SSB-SC since an AM receiver uses the carrier transmitted in DSB-TC to demodulate the AM signal. SSB-SC suppresses this carrier by definition. Since DSB-TC not only uses more bandwidth than SSB-SC, but also does not automatically demodulate SSB-SC and therefore interfere with other users of the spectrum, by the standards put forth by RM-11392, DSB-TC must be placed in specific subbands."

The petition does not address bandwidths in the phone portion of the amateur bands, only in the CW/RTTY segments of the bands which the FCC has already recognized as narrow bandwidth. This argument is therefore presenting an argument that does not address the issue at hand and should be ignored.

"3.) This Petition also would have the unintended consequence of suppressing further research into the Digital Radio Mondiale (DRM) voice mode. DRM is an open standard developed by a consortium of international broadcasters including the Voice of America and electronics manufacturers. DRM is being developed for HF international broadcasting and promises FM sound quality while using a narrower bandwidth than the DSB-TC mode presently being used by international broadcasters. The higher clarity of DRM would

be advantageous during emergency communications since there would be less repeats necessary on a busy voice channel. This would increase the number of messages that can be passed on a voice circuit during a given time frame would be increased. The increased clarity also translates to higher accuracies of the messages passed. Since DRM uses a digital code to encode and decode sound information, a crucial question arises: is DRM a digital mode or a voice mode? If DRM is a digital mode, then it must be used exclusively in the digital subbands. Since DRM would not automatically detect whether or not a narrow band mode such as PSK31 or RTTY is being used by other operators, the potential for interference exists. By the standards put forth by this Petition, DRM would need to be in separate subbands since DRM is "inharmonious and incompatible with the accepted operating principles of Amateur Radio on the HF bands". If DRM is a voice mode, then DRM must be permitted in specific subbands in the voice subbands since the DRM encoder/decoder will not detect transmissions in standard SSB-SC. Therefore, DRM is "inharmonious and incompatible with the accepted operating principles of Amateur Radio on the HF bands"."

Again, this comment is directed toward voice modes which the petition does not address.

"4.) This is a thinly-veiled attempt to prohibit the use of the Winlink 2000 protocol from the MF and HF bands allocated to the Amateur Service. Even though the intent of the Petitioner was not to prohibit Winlink 2000 on the MF and HF bands, this Petition has been seized upon by the opponents of Winlink as a first step to this prohibition. I must oppose the prohibition of Winlink 2000 on the basis that it is used by both Texas State RACES and Texas ARES. Although both Texas RACES and Texas ARES utilize traditional voice circuits to send messages from one served agency to another, both organizations have placed an emphasis on Winlink 2000 for the fast, accurate, and reliable passage of critical messages. Hampering emergency communications by effectively prohibiting Winlink from HF and MF bands would be contrary to 47 CFR 97.1(a). "

The author is mistaken here. Winlink 2000 (WL2K) is a *system* and not a protocol. The petition is not directed at wl2k in any way. The bandwidth limits proposed in the petition will not in any way stop critical messages from being passed during emergencies by WL2K.

This is hyperbole with no basis given for the claims.

"Although the Winlink program automatically controls the transmitter, it is incumbent upon the user to make sure that the frequency is clear before transmitting. This principle also applies to all other users of Amateur spectrum. This means that a PSK31 operator cannot initiate a QSO during a Winlink exchange and then claim malicious interference. 47 CFR 97.101 does not, nor should it, prioritize by modulation mode. If the opponents of Winlink can produce a method of automatically passing messages from one station to another with the same or better speed, accuracy, and reliability as Winlink that overcomes the objections raised against Winlink put forth by these opponents, then I am in favor of that solution."

The author is confusing WL2K with Pactor III. The petition does not address WL2K in any manner. If WL2K is being used to pass safety of life, disaster, or station in distress communications then referral to Part 97.401, 97.403, and 97.405 will address the issues raised here. If WL2K is being used to pass other types of messages then the issues of speed are not relevant. Packet, Pactor II, Pactor I, and PSKMail will provide accuracy and reliability equal to Pactor III.

"If the opponents of Winlink are either unable or unwilling to create such a solution, then do not tie the hands of Amateurs who are active in emergency communications work by requiring them to use modes and methods that worked in the past but are now outdated by both technology and the needs of Homeland Security and Emergency Management. Forcing Amateurs active in emergency communications on HF to use either CW or Voice, requiring manual transcription of the message, decreases the throughput and therefore the number of messages that can be sent from served agency to served agency. This means that critical

messages, including those with immediate life safety implications, will be delayed in the event of a communications emergency."

The petition does not ban any mode or protocol. Pactor III is still perfectly usable. The petition does not require reversion to any manual methods. This comment is hyperbole totally unrelated to the actual reality of the issues in the petition.

Again, the comment author is totally unfamiliar with Part 97.401, 97.403, and 97.405. These comments are totally irrelevant.

"In conclusion, I must oppose RM-11392 since it would pose an undue regulatory burden on automatic fowarding networks, discriminate against certain wide-band modes by prohibiting them while allowing other wide-band modes to exist without any increased regulatory burden whatsoever, force emergency communicators to use modes on MF and HF with lower speed and accuracy than provided by automatic fowarding networks, and provide a disincentive for experimentation in the HF and MF bands."

The petition will not impose any regulatory burden on automatic forwarding systems. It only impacts the bandwidths of the modes/protocols used by such systems. Nor does the petition prohibit any wide bandwidth mode. If the communications being sent fall under Part 97.401, 97.403, and 97.405 then the use of wider bandwidth modes could certainly be justified for those communications. communications which do not fall under those strictures have not been shown in these comments to be speed-dependent. In fact, in testimony before Congress concerning Katrina, FEMA rasised the issue that the speed of transmission of emails is not the largest issue in emergency communications. The largest issue is the recipient finding time to download and read all the emails. Emergency organizations depending on email to transmit critical, safety of life, time dependent information by email learned little from the FEMA experience during Katrina. Arguments speaking to the speed of email transmission in light of this experience should be considered with caution. As pointed out above, several modes/protocols provide accuracy equivalent to Pactor III. This is a specious argument.